



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/245,288	02/05/1999	AKIHIRO MURATA	101937	4735

25944 7590 03/19/2002

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

GRAYBILL, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2827

DATE MAILED: 03/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/245,288	MURATA, AKIHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David E Graybill	2827	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-12 and 19-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). <u>16,20</u> . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

Art Unit: 2827

The amendment to the claims filed 1-11-02 is non-responsive to the Office action filed 10-11-1 because it fails to conform to the provisions of MPEP 714.03:

714.03 Amendments Not Fully Responsive - Action To Be Taken:

Where a bona fide response to an examiner's action is filed before the expiration of a permissible period, but through an apparent oversight or inadvertence some point necessary to a complete response has been omitted - such as an amendment or argument as to one or two of several claims involved or signature to the amendment - the examiner, as soon as he or she notes the omission, should require the applicant to complete his or her response within a specified time limit (usually one month) if the period for response has already expired or insufficient time is left to take action before the expiration of the period. If this is done the application should not be held abandoned even though the prescribed period has expired.

Specifically, the objection to claim 11 has not been addressed.

Because the response appears to be bona fide, but through an apparent oversight or inadvertence the response is incomplete, and in order to continue to afford applicant the benefit of compact prosecution, the requirement to complete the response within a one month time limit is waived, the amendment is entered, and the claims are examined on the merits.

Claim 11 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Art Unit: 2827

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Thompson (5293067) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Thompson (5293067) or, further in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Thompson (5293067) and Rostoker (5767580).

The 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection is maintained as in the previous office action and is further addressed infra.

As cited, Thompson teaches a plurality of conduction sections 23 with substantially rectangular contour lines. To further clarify, In Figure 2, Thompson illustrates a conduction sections 23 with substantially rectangular contour lines.

Because applicant appears to have introduced the claimed limitation, "with substantially rectangular contour lines," primarily in order to overcome a rejection in view of Thompson alone, in the alternative, the claims are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Thompson, or further in the alternative, as obvious over Thompson in combination with Rostoker.

Although Thompson does not appear to verbatim teach the limitation, "with substantially rectangular contour lines," it would have been an obvious matter of design choice bounded by well known manufacturing constraints and ascertainable by routine experimentation and optimization to choose this particular dimension because applicant has not disclosed that the dimension is for a particular unobvious purpose, produces an unexpected result, or is otherwise critical, and it appears prima facie that the process would possess utility using another dimension. Indeed, it has been held that mere dimensional limitations are prima facie obvious absent a disclosure that the limitations are for a particular unobvious purpose, produce an unexpected result, or are otherwise critical. See, for example, *In re Rose*, 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955); *In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976); *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984),

Application/Control Number: 09/245,288
Art Unit: 2827

Page 5

cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984); In re Dailey,
357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).


Further in the alternative, at column 7, line 64 to column
8, line 29, Rostoker explicitly teaches conduction sections 23
with substantially rectangular contour lines. Moreover, it
would have been obvious to combine the product of Rostoker with
the product of Thompson because it would provide a conduction
section.

Applicant's remarks filed 2-14-2 have been fully considered
and are adequately addressed in the rejection supra.

***Any telephone inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status (MPEP
203.08) of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group
receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1782.***

Any telephone inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from
the examiner should be directed to David E. Graybill at (703) 308-2947. Regular office hours:
Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

The fax phone number for group 2800 is 703/305-3431.


David E. Graybill
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2827

D.G.
13-Mar-02